

Control Number: 51812



Item Number: 172

Addendum StartPage: 0



TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NAR 15 PM 12: 04

JAKE ELLZEY

PUBLIC UT LITY TOPMIC SION FILING CLINA

DISTRICT 10

March 10, 2021

Arthur D'Andrea, Chair Public Utility Commission of Texas P.O. Box 13326 Austin, TX 78711-3326

Dear Chairman D'Andrea,

The Public Utility Commission of Texas has a critical role in the tragic episodes of the winter disaster and ERCOT's actions due to the statutorily-prescribed role of the Public Utility Commission of Texas having oversight of ERCOT (Electric Reliability Council of Texas), the independent system operator for nearly all of Texas.

A letter, by the Independent Market Monitor (IMM), dated March 4, 2021, written to you and the other member of the Public Utility Commission of Texas reads as follows: "...ERCOT [Electric Reliability Council of Texas] continued to hold prices at VOLL [value of lost load (VOLL)] by inflating the Real-Time On-Line Reliability Deployment Price Adder for an additional 32 hours through the morning of February 19. This decision resulted in \$16 billion in additional costs to ERCOT's market, of which roughly \$1.5 billion was uplifted to load-serving entities to provide make-whole payments to generators for energy that was not needed or produced."

Regarding this matter, an article by the Texas Tribune ("Texas will not fix ERCOT's \$16 billion power billing mistake", written by Mitchell Ferman, published March 2, 2021) reads as follows: "D'Andrea added that a retroactive decision would have winners and losers: 'You don't know who you're hurting. And you think you're protecting the consumer, and it turns out you're bankrupting [someone else]." The Texas Tribune also reads as follows: "'I totally get how it looks like you're protecting consumers [by readjusting electric prices],' D'Andrea said Friday during a PUC meeting. 'But I promise you you're not.""

Constituents and many other Texans are demanding a detailed explanation of your actions or inactions. Related to the \$16 billion in additional costs to ERCOT's market, provide a detailed explanation of the following:

- 1. Who are, in your words, the "winners and losers" of the PUC decision to not take retroactive actions?
- 2. What are the financial impacts of each "winner and loser" of a PUC decision to not take retroactive measures?
- 3. What are the financial consequences to the electricity retail customer of the PUC decision to not take retroactive actions?
- 4. Who would be, in your words, the "winners and losers" of a PUC retroactive decision?
- 5. What would be the financial impacts of each "winner and loser" of a PUC retroactive decision?
- 6. What would be the financial consequences to the electricity retail customer of a PUC retroactive decision?

I look forward to your expeditious responses.

Sincerely,

Jake Elizey